

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

CHARLES HAMLETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

GREGORY MCLAUGHLIN, et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:12-CV-276 (MTT)

ORDER

Before the Court is the Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Charles H. Weigle. (Doc. 25). The Magistrate Judge recommends granting the Defendant's motion to dismiss (Doc. 18) because the Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies and has not stated a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Although he never responded to the Defendant's motion to dismiss, the Plaintiff has filed an objection to the Recommendation. (Doc. 26). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has considered the Plaintiff's objection and made a de novo determination of the portions of the Recommendation to which he objects. At most, the Plaintiff's objection indicates continued disagreement with the course of treatment he is being provided, and setting aside the other deficiencies in his complaint, the fact that he desires a different course of treatment is not deliberate indifference. *See, e.g., Hamm v. Dekalb Cnty.*, 774 F.2d 1567, 1575 (11th Cir. 1985).

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Recommendation and makes it the **ORDER** of this Court. The Defendant's motion to dismiss is **GRANTED** because the Plaintiff has not exhausted his administrative remedies and has failed to state a claim for relief.

SO ORDERED, this 15th day of July, 2013.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT